

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-17 remain unchanged from the original claims filed in the application.

It is respectfully requested that Applicants' arguments of record be incorporated herein.

Claims 1, 3, 4-6, 8-12, 14, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan et al. (hereinafter Rangan) in view of Chen et al. (hereinafter Chen). Applicants traverse the rejection.

In response to Applicants' last filed Response, wherein Applicants submitted arguments that Rangan does not in fact disclose a user selectable attribute for the hypervideo hyperlink, the Office Action maintains that Rangan does teach a user selectable attribute. The Office Action states, Rangan discloses "different selectable display topics such as: CNN, Titanic, NBC, Sports, Music, and shopping (listed as element 73 of fig. 2); each of the selectable topics can be a video/hypervideo that is being downloaded from a video server 9 (col. 25 lines 18-35), and each topic contains related frames (element 74 of fig. 2) to that particular topic as shown in fig. 2; therefore, each of the selectable attributes (related frames) of Rangan must also be a link which links back to the server source, when requesting for information of a particular topic."

Fig. 2 discloses a video-on-web VCR (i.e., VOW™ VCR). Applicants emphasize that the cited display topics CNN, Titanic, NBC, Sports, Music, and shopping disclosed in Fig. 2 are "channels" provided for being selected and viewed by the user (See Rangan, col. 25, ln. 19-21). That is, a user can select a channel such as CNN. Upon selection by the user, the user's viewer or browser is linked to the video server that downloads and displays the CNN channel content to the user. The CNN channel content is displayed in a manner similar to a conventional television broadcast or VCR playback.

Rangan discloses a list of "channels" that can be selected by the user. Rangan does not disclose providing the user with the at least one user selectable

Serial No.: 09/654,205  
Art Unit: 217474

display attribute, as alleged by the Office Action. There is nothing in the disclosure of Rangan that discloses or suggests that the display attributes of channel buttons 73 are selectable by the user. Selection of the channels is not related in any way to a display attribute of the selected channel or any other aspect of Rangan's video display system. Channels buttons 73 are merely channels that can be played on the VOW™ VCR.

Applicants respectfully submit that the meaning of the claimed "display attribute" is clear and unambiguous from the plain language of the claims, see claim 1 for example. Furthermore, Applicants remind the Office that the claims are always to be read in light of the specification. As such, it is clear from the claims, as supported by the specification, what "display attribute" refers to in the claims. For example, Applicants' specification states,

As used herein, the display attributes of a hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region include four main display options: 1) surrounding the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region with a white border; 2) displaying the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region as a specific color; 3) displaying the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region in gray-scale (i.e., black-and-white) video, while the rest of the video is in color; and 4) displaying the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region in reverse color mode. While only four emphasis options have been discussed, the invention may have more, less and different user-selectable emphasizing options without departing from the scope of the invention. (See Specification, pg. 5, ln. 1-8)

Clearly, a display attribute of the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region refers to a display characteristic of the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region.

Thus, it is clear that the Rangan disclosed channels are not the same as or suggestive of the claimed display attributes. The channels 73 are buttons for choosing a video content channel whereas the claimed display attribute refers to a display characteristic of the hypervideo hyperlink emphasis region.

Therefore, Rangan fails to disclose that for which it is cited and relied upon for disclosing. Namely, Rangan fails to disclose "providing to the user, at times of viewing, with at least one user selectable display attribute for the hypervideo hyperlink", as alleged by the Office Action.

Serial No.: 09/654,205  
Art Unit: 217474

Rangan does not disclose providing to the user, at times of viewing, with at least one user selectable display attribute for the hypervideo hyperlink. Consequently, even if Rangan were combined with Chen, the combination would not result in Applicants' claimed invention including providing to the user, at times of viewing, with at least one user selectable display attribute for the hypervideo hyperlink since Rangan fails to disclose a user selectable attribute.

While the Office Action's Response to Arguments are understood and considered by Applicants, from the above discussion (and previously submitted arguments) it is clear that the cited Rangan and Chen combination is insufficient to maintain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited and relied upon combination of Rangan and Chen fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited combination of Rangan and Chen.

Claims 11 is worded similarly to claim 1, and claim 12 depends from claim 11. It is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is patentable over Rangan and Chen for at least the reasons stated above regarding claim 1. Thus, claim 12 is also believed to be patentable.

Regarding claim 3, the Office's citation to col. 15, ln. 41-60 and Figs. 2, 4 fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed method further comprising the step of displaying to the user, at the time of viewing, an options menu listing said at least one user selectable display attributes, wherein said displaying of said options menu is selectively controlled by the user. (emphasis added)

In fact, referring to Rangan, col. 22, ln. 42-45 and col. 26, ln. 40-45, it appears that the web designer, and not the Subscriber/User/Viewer (SUV) determines the display attributes. That is, the display attributes are not user selectable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited and relied upon combination of Rangan and Chen fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in claim 3.

Claim 4 depends from claim 3. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is patentable over the cited and relied upon Rangan and Chen.

The rejections of claims 5 and 6 are based on the reasoning provided for the rejection of claim 1. As discussed above, it is Applicants' belief that claim 1 is patentable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited and relied upon combination of Rangan and Chen fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in claims 5 and 6.

The remaining rejected claims, named claims 8-10, 15, and 17 rely on the rejections of claims 3-5, 1, and 2, respectively, discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited and relied upon combination of Rangan and Chen fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of Applicants' claimed invention as recited in claim 8-10, 15, and 17 for at least the reasons stated above regarding claims 3-5, 1, and 2, respectively.

Claims 2, 7, 13, and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rangan in view of Chen as applied to claim 1, and in further view of Trueblood et al. (hereinafter, Trueblood). Applicants traverse the rejection.

In view of the shortcomings of the Rangan/Chen combination regarding claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 2, 7, 13, and 16 is improper. That is, since the Rangan/Chen combination fails to disclose or suggest that for which it is cited and relied, the further combination of Rangan/Chen and Trueblood does not support the rejection of claims 2, 7, 13, and 16.

Serial No.: 09/654,205  
Art Unit: 217474

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims 1-17 clearly distinguish over the cited and relied upon references for at least the reasons expressed above. Accordingly, the reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 103(a) rejection are requested, and the allowance of claims 1-17 is earnestly solicited.

7-6-04  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

Paul D. Greeley  
Paul D. Greeley  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 31,019  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
(203) 327-4500